



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of certain parts of the New Testament, and the removal of important texts out of their connection, will be regarded by many as arbitrary and fanciful. But the work as a whole is one of the most important and valuable extant contributions to the subject of eschatology.

MILTON S. TERRY.

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE,
Evanston, Ill.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. The Text.
By WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899. Pp. xv + 190. \$1.50.

THE first part of Dr. Green's *Introduction*, which treated of the canon, has been reviewed in a previous issue of this JOURNAL.¹ Since that review was published the distinguished author has ceased from his labors, and has left a vacancy that cannot easily be filled. For more than a generation universal consent has accorded to him a foremost place in the ranks of American Hebraists. To say that he was the ablest and most conspicuous champion of those views of the Old Testament which are sometimes characterized as traditional rather than critical, is only repeating what everybody knows. Able defenders of these conservative views still survive, but the man is not living who can don his armor or wield his sword.

In this second and concluding part of his *General Introduction* Dr. Green deals with *the text* of the Old Testament. In eight chapters he discusses its external form; the Semitic family of languages; Hebrew letters and vowels; Hebrew manuscripts; versions, such as the Septuagint, the Targums, the Syriac Peshito, the Latin Vulgate, and the Samaritan Pentateuch; then the history of the text; and, finally, the criticism of the text. The discussion of the language and its relation to other forms of human speech leads to the conclusion that the unchangeable, pictorial, and indefinite character of a Semitic language adapted it in a very remarkable way to become the vehicle of that preliminary revelation of the Old Testament "which was so largely figurative and symbolic in its character, which dealt in outlines and shadows." The history of Hebrew as a living tongue gives Dr. Green an opportunity to show, not merely how the language varied in different periods, and how it was affected by different styles of

¹ October, 1899, pp. 764-7.

composition, but also that the priestly document P, which the Graf-Wellhausen school claims to be of exilic origin or later, cannot post-date the other pentateuchal documents J, E, and D, which, by universal consent, are placed before the exile. The author opposes strenuously the common critical tendency to subject obscure passages to hypothetical emendations, and contends that the current Massoretic text presents the Old Testament Scriptures in a form so free from corruptions that changes are to be tolerated only in case of rare and palpable errors. The refusal of the Massorites to correct such errors is a proof of the fidelity with which the text has been transmitted. In comparison with the Massoretic text, that of the Septuagint has little critical value, and that of the Samaritan Pentateuch none at all.

Such, in brief, are the main positions of the book. That those who hold extremely conservative views concerning the text will welcome it as an able and convincing contribution to their side of the controversy is as certain as that those who hold opposite views will not be convinced by it. And naturally so, since it offers no new material for the solution of the problems under discussion, but contents itself with reaffirming what has already been said scores of times. To treat these positions disdainfully because they are traditional is absurd, but no more absurd than to reject all critical results because some of them conflict with older opinions.

Is it less reprehensible for a theologian to interpret facts in conformity with dogmatic postulates than for a critic to interpret them in conformity with philosophical prepossessions? When, for example, one biblical writer quotes another with verbal variations, is it worse for the critic, in conformity with literary analogies elsewhere, to suggest that these variations may be due to misquotation or transcriptional errors, than for Dr. Green to shut us up to the conclusion that "one inspired writer, in adopting the language of another, did not feel bound to repeat it verbatim, but, in the confidence of his equal inspiration, modified the form at pleasure to suit his immediate purpose" (p. 175)? It is conceivable that a modern theologian has no such personal experience of the psychology of inspiration as to pronounce oracularly on what an ancient prophet would or would not do.

One is justified in using the concessions and arguments of opponents in fortifying one's own positions; but not in such way as to convey the impression that these opponents are contending for the

same position, when they are not. Dr. Green, of course, holds that the pentateuchal document P is of Mosaic origin. Some modern critics have argued, however, that it betrays its late (that is, exilic or post-exilic) date by the presence of words of Aramaic form and meaning. When, now, Dr. Driver is quoted as demolishing this particular evidence, it does not follow that he also favors the Mosaic date. Yet, again and again, the reader is allowed to get this impression, until one who knows Dr. Driver's position is almost forced to ask: "What is this that is come unto the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?"

Here and there discussions are introduced that seem foreign to the purpose of the book. Such is the long quotation, pp. 47-54, wherein Dr. Driver shows that the late date of P cannot be proved from the preponderance in that document of *אני* over *אנכי*. This is really a problem in historical, and not in textual, criticism. On the other hand, it is surprising, in a book of this character, to find no reference to the remarkable differences between the Massoretic and Septuagint texts in their respective accounts of the introduction of David to the court of Saul. Speaking of the Septuagint, one may venture the opinion that few modern scholars can be found who, for critical purposes, place so low a value on this version and on the Samaritan Pentateuch as Dr. Green does, especially when the two happen to agree against the Massoretic text, which, as everyone knows, has attained its present fixedness by the rigorous suppression of variant manuscripts.

The fanciful derivation of "sincere" from *sine + cera*, "honey without wax," is given by Dr. Green, though this derivation is regarded as untenable by modern etymologists. A little more careful proof-reading would have noted the frequent omission of the point that distinguishes *ש* from *שׁ*, as well as many broken or omitted vowel-points.

PHILIP A. NORDELL.

BOSTON, MASS.

DAS BUCH KOHELETH UND DIE INTERPOLATIONSHYPOTHESE SIEGFRIEDS. Eine exegetische Studie. Von PROFESSOR LAUE, Lic. theol. Wittenberg: P. Wunschmann's Verlag, 1900. Pp. 28. M. 0.60.

THE book of Ecclesiastes is unique in its difficulties among the books of the Old Testament. Kleinert, Delitzsch, Volck, and other